

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Langelier (U.S. 2,216,886). Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker (U.S. 2,662,593).

Abstract of the Disclosure

Applicant is submitting a substitute Abstract of the Disclosure for that originally filed with this application to more clearly describe the claimed invention. Entry of the substitute Abstract of the Disclosure is respectfully requested.

Drawings

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted the drawings as originally filed with this application.

New Claims

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 1 and has added new claims 2 and 3 to this application. It is believed that the new claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and define subject matter that is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

The new claim is directed toward a retaining bracket structure for a cordless continuous folding blind (20) comprising: a pair of flexible brackets (30), each of the pair of flexible brackets having: a pressing plate (31) located in a center thereof; two clamping arms (32) having a C-shape, one of the two clamping arms is connected at a first end thereof to each of two opposing sides of the pressing plate; and two pointed hooks (33), one of the two pointed hooks is located on a second end of each of the two clamping arms and protruding inwardly toward the first end of each of the two clamping arms, wherein each of the pair of flexible brackets is removably connected to a folded blind section being a predetermined length of the cordless continuous folding blind, the pressing plate and the two pointed hooks are located

on a top of the folded blind section and the two clamping arms extend around a bottom of the folded blind section.

The first primary reference to Langelier teaches a holder including a strip (6) having a pair of notches (8) with protruding jaws (8a).

Langelier does not teach one of the two pointed hooks is located on a second end of each of the two clamping arms and protruding inwardly toward the first end of each of the two clamping arms, nor does Langelier teach the pressing plate and the two pointed hooks are located on a top of the folded blind section and the two clamping arms extend around a bottom of the folded blind section.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. Applicant submits that it is abundantly clear, as discussed above, that Langelier does not disclose each and every feature of Applicant's new claims and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Absent a specific showing of these features, Langelier cannot be said to anticipate either of Applicant's new claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The second primary reference to Walker teaches Venetian Blind Parts including a spring clip (48) connected to a slat (40).

Walker does not teach one of the two pointed hooks is located on a second end of each of the two clamping arms and protruding inwardly toward the first end of each of the two clamping arms, nor does Walker teach the pressing plate and the two pointed hooks are located on a top of the folded blind section and the two clamping arms extend around a bottom of the folded blind section.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. Applicant submits that it is abundantly clear, as discussed above, that Walker does not disclose each and every feature of Applicant's new claims and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Absent a specific showing of these features, Walker cannot be said to anticipate either of Applicant's new claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Application No. 10/660,513

It is further submitted that neither Langelier nor Walker disclose, or suggest any modification of their specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Thus, it is not believed that either Langelier or Walker render obvious either of Applicant's new claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 2, 2005

By:


Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707